

Date: Thu, 9 Dec 93 04:30:15 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #519
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 9 Dec 93 Volume 93 : Issue 519

Today's Topics:

ARRL's callsign admin position (3 msgs)
W5YI's coverage of "temporary callsigns"
 WHOA! Beavis, this SUCKS!

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 7 Dec 93 19:40:00 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL's callsign admin position
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

> In article <L445Dc2w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,
> Dan Pickersgill N8PKV <dan@mystis.wariat.org> wrote:
> >The do NOT represent "_all_" hams.
>
> If they don't, who does? I guarandamntee you that _someone_ must, or else we
> are sunk.
>
> > They do not pepresent me at this time
> >and there are MANY hams that I know who are not memebers of the ARRL.
> >Although, as I have previously stated, I feel that the ARRL is doing a
> >pretty good job of late, I tend to agree with Greg in that the ARRL
> >seems to feel that they are the 'one true voice of all amateur radio'.
> >They are NOT. They may represent a good portion, maybe a majority, but

> >in NO way do they represent ALL Amateurs!
>
> Someone does. That someone is the ARRL, by default if nothing else.
>
> >As I said, I have been impressed of late and am considering sending the
> >ARRL a dues check. However there are may organizations that represent a
> >good number of amateurs (W5YI as an example).
>
> Hate to tell you this, guy, but Fred Maia, W5YI, is not an organization - he'
> a newsletter publisher.

For the purposes of some recient proposals, I believe, W5YI represented
itself as an organization (quoting a membership of all it's
subscribers). And W5YI is a VEC, does he do all the work himself?

But, maybe you are right, we need a second national ham group. Anyone
wanna help me start one?

>
> The only groups I'm aware of that even try to be a national voice are QCWA -
> which, by definition, only represents those who were hams at least 25 years
> ago (and therefore neither me nor you) - and Don Stoner's NARA, which is
> explicitly aimed at the new ham.

(see above)

>
> > Now, the other
> >organizations have not been around as long as the ARRL and are just
> >getting started. However they are growing. The age of the ARRL being the
> >exclusive national ham organization is long past.
>
> There is _NO_ other national ham organization designed for all.

If not there is a need, indeed. (ARGH! Puckey pun!)

>
> >If my congressman called the FCC it would make an impact. And believe
> >you, me, MY congressman is willing to listen to those of us who sent
> >him to DC.
>
> ...but is your congressman aware of how hams around the country feel about
> issues, and the national importance of ham radio? There's a fundamental
> difference between Dan pickersgill, constituent, and ham radio. We need both.
>
> >W5YI and all the other groups that have proposed to take over the
> >'vanity licensing' proposal.
>

> The League had valid points, even if the overall presentation let something t
> be desired. (Yes, I have let my director know what I thought of that.) Again,
> _none_ of those groups are for all hams; they're for some subset of hams.

Again, I think W5YI might take exception. (Not that I speak for W5YI, I
do NOT!)

>
> > Wayne Green bashing is a usefull as ARRL
> >bashing (less in fact, Wayne Green isn't claiming to be the 'one true
> >voice of amateurs').
>
> ...not to mention that Wayne Green is much more of a buffoon than anyone with
> the League ever thought of being.

Wayne Green bashing is a usefull as ARRL bashing (less in fact, Wayne Green
isn't claiming to be the 'one true voice of amateurs').

(There I go repeating myself. This is the N8PKV REPEATER.)
(At least I am not talking to myself.)

> >Since when has our (amateur community) relationship with the FCC become
> >totally adversarial?
>
> 220 MHz.

I said "totally".

> If you don't understand that, you have completely missed the essential
> bureaucratic mindset. That grab was the result of a bureaucracy run amok, and
> bureaucracies don't forget.

Private interests had SOMETHING to do with it.

> >As I have said, the ARRL is improving. (Can we get rid of incentive
> >licensing now guys? Like the social programs of the 60's, it isn't in
> >the national interest.) (There I said it, look out now!)
>
> I'd flame that one, but it's been hashed over quite a bit as it is; short for
> answer is that while we're implementing the welfare state in ham licensing, w
> might as well do away with that too. (That was sarcasm.)

That 'welfare state' arguement is so pathtic, no one has suggested that.
Even the coralary is a far stretch.

Welfare doesn't further the national interest, neither does incentive
licensing. We should loose both.

(I do not intend to invite a flame. But I had to respond.)

>
> >No. Just honest and truly representative of its members.
>
> Again, you totally fail to understand the bureaucratic mindset. Any group tha
> comes across as fragmented to a bureaucrat will get completely ignored.

Jay, I honestly hope that our relationship with the FCC is not as bad as you say (in fact I know it is not from the dealings our area hams have with the FCC). If it were, Amateur Radio would be lost.

I can agree to some of what you said. United front and all. But before the ARRL decides what all amateurs want, maybe they could come out of the board room and ask a few of us?

73,

--

```
-----  
| Dan Pickersgill  N8PKV      | 'Pots have handles, Magazines have |  
| dan@mystis.wariat.org      |      Personals, Hams have Names' |  
-----  
|           Crime in America is a thing of the PAST!!!           |  
|           The Brady Bill is Law.                               |  
-----
```

Date: Mon, 6 Dec 1993 14:47:53 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!greg@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: ARRL's callsign admin position
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2dvabk\$3og@mailier.fsu.edu> michaela@freenet2.scri.fsu.edu (Michael Christie) writes:

>
>Re: Call Sign Administration Hassle
>
>Nice set of comments, Brian. You are right on target.
>
>ARRL needs to proceed slowly and responsibly on this one. I thought
>they had their "politically smart" hat on these days, but after this
>recent nonsense, I'm not so sure.

I see no indication that the ARRL has changed the fundamental assumption which it has held over the years. Despite changing the wording of the

'Ham Radio Creed,' or whatever that rhetoric is, their fundamental position remains the same. (Does anyone remember the dreck under 'The Radio Amateur is Loyal' heading? The bit about 'he owes his amateur radio to the ARRL and offers it his unswerving loyalty?' That's what has changed, some time following the infamous ARRL vs. Wayne Green 'support incentive licensing or we'll sue you and drive you out of business' stuff.)

As far as I can tell, the ARRL's position is that they are the one and only voice of Amateur Radio in the US, whatever position the Board takes is immediately the one with which the majority of US Amateurs concur, and any interface to Federal policymakers should be through them, and them alone.

As evidence for this, I take:

- 1) The League's history of opposing any petition which does not come through them, as a matter of routine (a.k.a. 'not invented here' syndrome')
- 2) Having been told by League officers and staffers that if I left the ARRL, I was giving up all of my representation in Washington (as if I don't vote in Federal elections?).
- 3) Having watched, over the years, the ARRL's vigorous opposition to anyone or anything which presumed to encroach on 'its' territory. Particularly unfortunate, IMO, have been some of the underhanded efforts to silence anyone who would either compete for a role or present an opposing opinion.

In the ARRL's defense, I think that much of this has been in the honest belief that it is necessary to present the FCC bureaucracy with a united front. The latter is probably sensible, where possible. However, the League, in its zeal to do the best thing for the hobby, has all too often forgotten that this is a pluralistic society. I suspect that such oversight has caused particular rancor because of the number of people who are aware that it is only in a pluralistic society that ordinary folk are given the key (ahem) or microphone to a radio station which is capable of blanketing the entire society, indeed the globe, with the ideas of those ordinary folk.

It seems to me that the Board of Directors would do well, in presenting position papers to the FCC, to pursue a policy of also bringing forward an occasional 'dissenting opinion,' from within the ranks of amateur radio. In doing so, they would increase their stock by demonstrating that they truly ARE representative of amateur radio as a whole.

As far as I can tell, (my literature collection goes back pretty far), the

ARRL had few enemies from within the ranks until the mid-sixties and the incentive licensing debacle (and by 'debacle,' I don't mean the fact that we now have incentive licensing, I mean the manner in which the parties interacted at the time). That was almost thirty years ago.

It seems to me that it's high time that the ARRL board went to some lengths to extend an olive branch to the enemies made by another board, a generation ago. And, in the process, to try and understand how previous boards made enemies, and modify practices such that this ideal of being truly representative can be achieved. After thirty years, it's clear that it won't be achieved by trying to whip the rank and file into line.

Greg

Date: 9 Dec 93 08:50:31 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo!sugar!rcoyle@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL's callsign admin position
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <L445Dc2w165w@mystis.wariat.org>, dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:

```
> -----  
> |           Crime in America is a thing of the PAST!!!           |  
> |           The Brady Bill is Law.                               |  
> -----
```

If you honestly believe this, Dan, you're an even bigger fool than I first thought you were.

--Robert
--

```
-----  
| Anyone who cannot cope with Morse code is not fully human.  At best |  
| he is a tolerable subhuman who has learned to wear shoes, bathe, and |  
| not make messes in the house.                                         |  
-----
```

Date: 7 Dec 93 19:59:05 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: W5YI's coverage of "temporary callsigns"
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

cbr600@maico.ksu.ksu.edu (Jeremy L. Utley) writes:

> Well, it's because AT is not a valid prefix for US operation (or that's what
> told). US only has the prefixs AA-AL so AT would be an invalid prefix for th
> united states. That's also why we can't have A prefix's for 1x3 Tech/General
> callsigns. :(Here in 0-land, we're just about out of 1x3 calls and most oth
> areas are already out of them. Seems to me instead of dropping down to 2x3 N
> the FCC should start recycling old w0 and k0 calls that are no longer used!
> well, whoever said the buearucracy was sane.
>
> Smiley's implied, of course!!!

Here in 8-land we ARE out, AA8xx Extra and KB8xxx Nov/Tec/Gen. Advanced
still has a bunch left KG or KH last checked. I would have even
prefered NA8xxx as opposed to a "Novice" call, but to no avail...

--

```
-----
| Dan Pickersgill N8PKV      | 'Pots have handles, Magazines have |
| dan@mystis.wariat.org    |      Personals, Hams have Names' |
|                           |                                     |
|           Crime in America is a thing of the PAST!!! |
|           The Brady Bill is Law.                    |
|                           |                                     |
|-----|
```

Date: Mon, 6 Dec 1993 14:39:18 GMT
From: pacbell.com!att-out!cbnewst!waco@ames.arpa
Subject: WHOA! Beavis, this SUCKS!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CHEr5E.FpI@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> jreese@NeoSoft.com (Jim Reese) writes

>In article <CHD3ox.AoC@cbnewst.cb.att.com> waco@cbnewst.cb.att.com (WB9VGJ)
writes:

>>
>> Not to belittle the problem of mental defects, low-lifes and assorted
>> criminals killing innocent people
>
>You just did...
>
>> Laurie Dann, I believe, used a sem-automatic weapon. A semi-automatic
>> pistol operates like a revolver (as used by Roy Rogers and Gene Autry);
>> you pull the trigger, the gun shoots. Pull again, the gun shoots again.
>
>What's the difference? The kids are still DEAD!

I suppose had she used a butcher knife Morton Grove would have banned them instead of handguns. Certainly are more unstable folks with easy access to butcher knives than handguns.

She shouldn't have been eligible to own a gun in IL, but no system is 100% perfect, unfortunately.

>--

> Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "I can do more in two minutes than Rush can in
>jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | three hours" --Jim Hightower

I hereby flame myself as this discussion really belongs on talk.politics.guns, but I started it.

73,

John, WB9VGJ

```
=====
John L. Broughton | snail mail: Room 1K-324
AT&T              |                1200 E. Warrenville Rd.
                  |                P.O. Box 3045
                  |                Naperville, IL 60566-7045
                  |                (708) 713-4319
                  |                e-mail: john.l.broughton@att.com
                  |                att!john.l.broughton
                  |                air mail: WB9VGJ
=====
```

Date: 6 Dec 93 19:20:36 GMT
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!news.intercon.com!udel!
news.sprintlink.net!connected.com!beauty!rwing!eskimo!mzenier@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Dec1.001017.936@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>,
<1993Dec5.144408.23703@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <CHKvMw.2zI@news.Hawaii.Edu>imo
Subject : Re: Why isn't Amateur Radio like CB?

In <CHKvMw.2zI@news.Hawaii.Edu>, Jeff Herman wrote:
: It must have been a slap in the face for amateurs to lose 11 meters.
: (My FT-101 has 11M on its band switch). Even in the 'bad years' of the
: sunspot cycle 11M still jumps with DX. Why was the ham activity so
: low that it was taken away?

It's also an ISM (Industrial Scientific Medical) band. In the current regs. at 27120 kHz +/- 163 kHz.

My favorite paragraph in the regs.

18.305(a) ISM equipment operating on a frequency specified in paragraph 18.301 is premitted unlimited radiated energy in the band specified for that frequency.

Mark Zenier mzenier@eskimo.com markz@ssc.com

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #519
